

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
THE VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION
THE BOARD OF THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER
EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA**

Joint Meeting

**October 9, 1997
6:30 P.M.**

**The Richmond Omni Hotel
100 South 12th Street**

MINUTES

In Attendance:

Board of Education Members:

Michelle Easton, President
Lil Tuttle, Vice-President
John Russell
Rayford L. Harris, Sr.
J. Brandon Bell
Cheri P. Yecke
Beverly H. Sgro, Secretary of Education
Richard T. La Pointe, Secretary and Superintendent of Public Instruction

Council of Higher Education Members:

Elizabeth A. McClanahan, Chair
John D. Padgett, Vice Chairman
Jeff Brown
John Gerdelman
Douglas Gynn
H. Lynn Hopewell
Robert Spilman

Ms. Elizabeth McClanahan called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. She introduced Michelle Easton, President of the Board of Education. The meeting was called to order to address issues of common concern to the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). This was the second joint meeting in 1997 between the Board of Education and SCHEV.

Mrs. Easton addressed the joint meeting and reviewed the biggest projects the Board has been working on during the past year. She stated that the Board had completed the Standards of Learning (K-12) in Virginia in English, Science, Math and History. They were close to implementing the new rigorous academic tests. These test will be given at 3rd grade, 5th grade, 8th grade and high school (end of course test). The Standards of Accreditation (SOA) were finalized at the Board's September meeting. Mrs. Easton provided an overview of the process for implementing the new SOA.

Discussion of State Council of Higher Education's Remediation Report

Mrs. McClanahan, Chair, reported on the State Council's Remediation Report for those who were not on the State Board in February 1997 when SCHEV and the Board of Education met jointly. This report is a result of a discussion that the two boards had together about the 1994 statistics on Remediation.

As a result, the state council's staff were requested to update these statistics in hopes of better results; however, there is not much difference between the 1994 and the 1997 statistics. The Interim Director of SCHEV, Dr. J. Michael Mullen and Dr. Jim Alessi, SCHEV alumni and current Calculus teacher in southside Richmond presented the remediation report.

Dr. Mullen and Dr. Alessi outlined remediation and showed where Virginia stands now. Dr. Alessi reported that there is very little remediation at the four-year institutions. Remediation is primarily taught at the community college system level. Remediation enrollments in Virginia from 1981-1996 are approximately eleven percent of credit hours. Remedial courses are defined as any activity not at the college level. Placement tests are given to screen students to determine whether or not they are at the remedial level. At the four-year institutions, freshmen had 5% of remedial work compared with 52% at the 2-year institutions. Non-remedial students generally have a higher grade point average compared to remedial students.

Three out of 15 public institutions in Virginia have remedial programs. Their mission is to take in students as long as they have a high school diploma or equivalent. This report compares remediation for 4-year and 2-year institutions. Comparison have been made in 4-year institutions - 35% of students were in some form of remediation compared to 50% of students at 2-year institutions. Mr. Alessi feels students are well prepared on the college track. Students should start preparing for college in the 7th or 8th grade.

Generally, the bigger the high school the lower the remediation rate and generally smaller high schools have higher remediation rates. Students from high family incomes generally do better on SATs than do lower income families. The SAT II is for the students who apply for universities with lower acceptance rates. The SAT is for college entrance only. Students usually take them in their junior year of high school.

Students with advance studies diplomas are much more likely not to be in a remediation program.

Mrs. Yecke indicated this data is a reflection of a system which demands a sixth grade level Literacy Passport Test. She suggested that we need to continue to collect data. The community college system helps students who didn't prepare well or fell behind in high school. The estimated cost of remediation to the Commonwealth is approximately \$27 million according to Ms. McClanahan, SCHEV.

Senator Russell had some concerns about how figures were computed. Senator Russell felt there are too many high school kids that are taking remedial courses in colleges. It cost the taxpayers too much money. Mrs. McClennan indicated she would get figures in writing for Senator Russell.

Mrs. Yecke reported on a program in Hanover County called AHanover Compact.® This is a program which guarantees their graduates are prepared for college or the workplace. Hanover County stands behind their graduates and will pay for any remedial work after graduation. This is a model program and Mrs. Yecke has information available to board members upon request.

Mrs. Tuttle thinks it would be helpful to get together and assess and develop an agenda for the remediation problem. She feels remediation gives kids second chances. It would help to know where remediation is in Virginia. She requested SCHEV provide the Board with data. Mrs. McClanahan suggested staff get together and look at data, assess the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) remediation program and also develop an agenda for what to do about this problem.

Discussion of the Board of Education's Proposed Teacher Technology Regulations

Dr. Elliott reported on initiatives attempted in the development of technology standards. There are 37 colleges and universities that prepare teachers for licensure and accreditation. Technology standards will be implemented in approximately one year. Public Hearings to discuss licensure and standards will be held.

The Department of Education is attempting to develop technology standards for instructional personnel for career initiatives. Those technology standards are not only required for individuals in the school system, but schools are responsible for implementing the standards into the SOLS and assuring that students are demonstrating technology proficiency at the 5th and 8th grades.

Technology standards have been in the public schools for about a year. On September 17, 1997, we conducted public hearing on licensure regulations. The public accepted and believed the standards are very appropriate and they would prepare students in the 5th and 8th grades very effectively. Proficiency levels of teachers would be demonstrated within these requirements. Some proposed that the hearing should be tied to the renewal of a teacher's license. In order to have a consistent proficiency level, some type of assessment are put on these standards. Dr. Elliott's staff is in the process of developing pros and cons around these issues. ABTEL will be meeting on October 19-20, 1997 and will have a proposal for the Board as it relates to proficiency around the Standards.

Mrs. Yecke reported that teachers were grateful that the technology standards have no checklist and that there is more flexibility.

Discussion of the State Council of Higher Education's Guidelines for Technology in Teacher Education Programs

A. Draft Guidelines for Technology in the Commonwealth's State-Approved Teacher-Education Programs

Laura Ford, Senior Coordinator, Academic Affairs, SCHEV, reported on House Bill 1848 (HB 1848) of General Assembly. HB 1848 requires that SCHEV with the Department of Education and the accreditation teaching education in the state development guidelines to seek to ensure that teacher education students are prepared to meet standards embodied in Virginia's Technology Standards.

House 1848 - SCHEV has established institutes to provide technology training for teachers, administrators, and librarians in elementary and secondary schools of the Commonwealth. The institutions are required to be at no more than three sites which may include 2-year and 4-year public institutions. For the past two fiscal years, the General Assembly has appropriated funds for pilot institute programs which were held during the summer of 1996-97 at Virginia Tech, Old Dominion University, and Dabney Lancaster Community College. The General Assembly has asked SCHEV for recommendations for establishing institutes on a permanent basis. The Legislative mandates that the governing bodies of public instruction of higher education to establish programs to seek to ensure that all graduates have the technology skills necessary to compete in the 21st century.

In the Spring of 1997, a task force was developed which included presentations from SCHEV, Virginia Department of Education, Accredited Teacher Education Programs, and other related groups to develop guidelines required on House Bill 1848. The stated goal of the task force was to provide guidance for all approved teacher education program in the Commonwealth concerning what is reasonably necessary in order for graduates to meet the Standards specified by the General Assembly. The task force developed a set of 31 guidelines which indicated best practices in each of nine areas that encompassed virtually all aspects of technology such as: Infrastructure, Hardware, Software, Technology Assistance, Faculty Development, Professional Development, Curriculum, Laboratory and Media Resource Centers and Assessment for students proficiencies. The guidelines are advisory only and have no regulatory affect in their current form. They will be submitted to the Council of Higher Education for approval so that they may be transmitted to the Governor and the General Assembly before the opening of 1998 General Assembly session. Task force recommended that guidelines be considered by ABTEL. Depending on ABTEL's reaction to the guidelines, they could come to the Council at a later date - either in their current form or as modified by ABTEL.

Dr. Glen Bull, Director of the Curry Center for Technology and Teacher Education, provided an overview of House Bill 1848 in the areas of preservice technology guidelines, and in-service teacher education including three pilot workshops done over the past two summers.

Dr. Bull noted that the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) feels that if teachers do not understand how to employ technology to promote student learning, the billions of dollars invested in educational technology will be wasted. There is currently \$200 million spent on technology in Virginia. He said that Virginia has made good progress. We have adopted two six-year technology plans. Many school divisions are working toward providing every classroom with direct access to the Internet. Currently, a variety of computers such as the Atari 1977, Apple II, DOS, Windows 3.1, Windows 95, MacIntosh are being used in schools. Teachers need some exposure to diversity in computers as well as software programs. He noted that Barbara Honeycutt became Virginia's Teacher of the Year, in part because of her effective use of technology.

Secretary Sgro suggested we need figures from SCHEV in order to know if the technology training is a priority. She also suggested that SCHEV conduct periodic follow-ups to the 37 institutions.

B. Institutes for Teacher Technology

1996 Key Findings and Recommendations:

- C Emphasize content and pedagogy, not just technical skills
- C Implied content-specific expertise by instructors
- C On-going follow-up support (technical & curricular) after workshops needed

Currently, we are in Year 2 of collecting information. Year 2 Evaluation - Progress

- C Interviews with program directors
- C Site visits
- C Pre- and post-surveys administered
- C Follow-up interview with sample subset of participants and program directors

The project directions completion is scheduled for December 15, 1997. Evaluation criteria include:

- C Reported level of satisfaction with training
- C Perceived confidence levels
- C Perceived competence with technology standards

Discussion of the Board of Education's Proposed Licensure Regulations

Mrs. Easton introduced Dr. Thomas Elliott. Dr. Elliott gave a brief overview on the Board of Education's proposed licensure regulations. He indicated that ABTEL will make recommendations at its next meeting. Dr. Elliott reported that the Department of Education received over 350 responses in writing between the dates of October 7, 1996 and March 26, 1997 from professional organizations, college/university, parents, grandparents, Department of Education staff, etc. The majority of comments dealt with the Special Education proposals. The second largest number of comments were concerning the business education endorsement and vocational education. The third largest comments were concerning the middle school endorsement.

Mr. Tom Smith, Special Education Advisory Committee reported on 21 differences representing parents, teachers, administrators, school board personnel, superintendents, and consumers. The proposals that is before us is not about classroom placement. Placement is based on individual students needs - not on teacher certification.

Mr. Smith reported that the ADHOP group came together to address the issue of how we are going to help teachers have the tools necessary to teach the SOLS to children with disabilities. There is an extremely strong opinion among parents, as well as school personnel, that children with disabilities should have access to SOLS.

Mrs. Mary Bicouvaris is a former teacher from Hampton High School. She was Virginia's 1989 Teacher of the Year as well as the 1989 National Teachers of the Year. Ms. Bicouvaris is presently a teacher at Christopher Newport Community College. She reported the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) has rated the quality of standards created by the states. In the 48 states currently developing academic standards, Virginia was the only one who has grade by grade standards in every subject, English, Math, Science and History, that were recognized as exemplary by the AFT.

Mrs. Bicouvaris spoke to the Boards about 1) the need to teach teachers how to teach, 2) the role of the textbook industry as it pertains to developing new standards, 3) different learning styles, and 4) teacher recertification requirements.

What will cost of college degree for teachers? Dr. Elliott reported that colleges/universities implementing standards would create financial problems. We proposed a series of endorsement based on competencies based on SOLS, National Curricula and Praxis (beginning teacher assessment that teachers will have to pay). Restructuring what is currently in place would be costly.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.